

[Dr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [24th August 1925]

sub-section (3), shall be in force for a period of ten years from the date of such determining and may be revised by the Commissioner at the termination of such successive periods of ten years."

Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA :—"I second it."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"I think, Sir, that this Bill deals with the same subject as the hon. Member Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti's Bill does. But, as I have stated, the policy of the Government is, generally speaking, not to oppose motions for leave for the introduction of Bills. I should however like that the hon. Mover does not make his motion. If he moves, I do not propose to oppose the motion."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Sir, I wish to make a personal explanation. It was suggested to me that my motion might be withdrawn in view of the fact that the Corporation itself was instituting a committee to suggest all comprehensive amendments and, in deference to the request made by the Secretary to the Local Self-Government Department, I begged of you to allow me to withdraw my Bill. Now, my hon. Friend, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar, is dealing in his Bill only with one of the many amendments which I have sent in for incorporation in the Bill and even that amendment of Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar, as I will be able to show, does not satisfy our requirements. Therefore, as has been said, nothing will be lost by withdrawing this motion. Necessary amendments to the Bill may be passed in the October session."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920,
AND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARD'S ACT, 1920,
OF MR. V. PANTULU AYYAR.

* Mr. V. PANTULU AYYAR :—"Under Standing Order No. 38 I beg leave to introduce a Bill^a to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920. Sir, this is a Bill for the introduction of which this honourable House was on a previous occasion pleased to grant leave. The main object of this Bill is to amend sections 45 (c), 46 (1) and 52 of the Madras Local Boards Act. The Act as it stands makes the payment qualification the *sine qua non* for eligibility to vote at municipal elections. The one object intended to be served by this Act could only have been to facilitate the collection of municipal dues by holding out payment before a certain period, i.e., before the end of the financial year, as an incentive to possessing elective franchise. But in practical administration this object has not been attained as may be found from various Government reports which show that there has been always a large amount of uncollected taxes in various municipalities. This non-collection is due to the utter indifference shown by most of the municipal councils in the matter of collection. Moreover, elections occur only once in three years for each ward, so that payment qualification even if useful will serve only in the case of a fraction of the tax-payers, and will not serve the purpose for which it is

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, Part IV, dated 3rd March 1925.

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920, AND 597
THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920, OF MR. V. PANTULU AYYAR

24th August 1925]

[Mr. V. Pantulu Ayyar]

intended. It often serves to defeat its own end, because it serves as a handle in ingenious hands to bring down the voting strength of elective wards to a minimum point. The Government reports themselves admit that the electoral rolls are not prepared in strict conformity with the provisions of the Act. Many sitting members of municipalities have not paid their taxes and many voters find their names in the electoral rolls even though they have not paid their taxes at all. In a recent meeting of the Madras Corporation, this same anomaly was referred to. The then President who is now on the Treasury Bench—I mean the hon. Khan Bahadur Usman Sahib—was pleased to support it and he said that whereas for the electorates of the Legislative Councils and Assembly no such qualification was necessary it was an anomaly that such a qualification should be thought necessary for municipal and corporation elections alone. Mr. Sundara Rao Nayudu, a member of the Justice Ministerialist party in the Corporation, said that it was an anomaly that even a tenant was allowed to vote, whereas a landlord who did not pay a rupee did not find his name in the voters' list. In the Corporation this was unanimously passed. In the case of local boards, the section is inoperative as the tax-collecting agency is the Government and elections do generally come off only once in three years. This is not a party question. The Act, as it stands, serves only to defeat its end, and instead of educating the electorate to an extended franchise, it only serves to restrict it. Already the electorate is too narrow and even a proper working of it is restricted with conditions operating heavily against the growth of citizenship. I beg to commend this motion to this hon. House for leave that it be read in Council."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"I second it."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT after a pause for a minute or two, noticing no Member rising to speak on it, said :—"I will now put the motion to the House."

The motion was put and declared carried and permission was granted to read the Bill in Council.

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Sir, I have not spoken on this motion."

Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasaya :—"You, Sir, have already said that it be read in Council."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Yes, Sir, I am going to oppose it."

* Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I rise to a point of order, Sir. When once you have declared the motion carried, the hon. Minister can take only some other ways by which he can oppose the Bill."

12-45 p.m.

* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"But since the responsible Minister says that he has misunderstood the whole thing, I think it would be very generous on the part of the House not to take advantage of a mistake of the Chair or a mistake due to the silence of the Treasury Bench. I do not think that ours are the laws of the Persians and the Medes (roars of laughter). I must apologize to the House for having committed a mistake under a misapprehension."

[24th August 1925]

* Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"The House is perfectly willing to be as generous as possible. The only question is whether when you have declared a question carried, it is open to you to revoke it. Surely the hon. the Minister may take other opportunities to oppose the Bill. This is only the first reading of the Bill. The hon. Minister may oppose the third reading of the Bill and oppose the motion that the Bill be passed into law and thereby he may make it ineffective."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"I have no objection to that course. What I say is that there was no opportunity given to the Minister in charge to speak on the motion. The motion was not discussed; it was simply proposed and seconded."

* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"I said that the Bill was moved and seconded. And according to the hon. Minister's practice of according approval for every measure hitherto introduced to-day, I thought he was not going to oppose it. (Laughter). The hon. Member in charge of the Bill will move for a Select Committee on the Bill and then it will be open to the hon. Minister to oppose the Bill and then there will be an end of the thing. They insist on technicalities; they are going to ask for a Select Committee and the hon. the Raja of Panagal may oppose it."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"I have no objection to adopt that course. The only complaint that I want to make is that there was a misunderstanding as to the motion itself. You said, Sir, that these benches generally gave their accord to the motions that were made. Hitherto the motions made were all motions for leave. Because they were motions for leave we did not oppose; that, however, does not mean that we do not oppose any motion."

* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"Some mistake was committed."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI :—"May I ask for a poll on this question?"

* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"I may point out one thing. The motion as printed is that the Member of the Legislative Council will introduce a Bill to amend, etc. I said that the Member of the Legislative Council probably wanted the Bill to be read in Council. My suggestion was adopted and the motion was moved. The Bill is not going to the Select Committee. Since the hon. the First Minister agreed to every motion that was brought forward, I thought I could put the motion to the House. What is the next step? I am in the hands of the House."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"I have no objection. Let the declaration stand. If the motion that the Bill be referred to the Select Committee is made, Government will oppose the motion."

* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"Then this motion is carried. Is the hon. Member Mr. Krishna Rao satisfied?"

* Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"It is not a question of my being satisfied. I fear we cannot lose sight of technicalities."

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

* Mr. V. PANTULU AYYAR :—"I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of"

24th August 1925] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

words of Mr. Boag who was Commissioner of the Corporation in expressing his opinion on this point. 'It seems to be monstrous to say that the tenant without any provocation from the landlord can force him to sell any portion of his land.' It is really monstrous, and I hope the hon. the Mover and the Supporter will see the other side of the question also. On one side of the land, there may be a number of tenants and it may strike one tenant to ask the landlord to sell this plot of land. If the tenant is enabled to get this land sold to him, what will be the effect of parting away with a portion of land upon the rest of the land. I cannot now discuss the propriety of trying to confiscate property from one hand and transferring it to another. It seems to me that all this may be euphemistically called acquisition of occupancy rights, but on that account we must not make the landlord suffer and compel him to sell his land to any tenant. After all, I am afraid whether it is the tenant that will ultimately be bettered. I can conceive of instances in which a money-lender or sowcar may come in the middle, may negotiate with the tenant and compel the landlord to sell, so that the land may pass from one landlord to another resulting in injury greater to the tenant from the latter. As I said at the beginning, I do not want to oppose the introduction of this Bill or its being referred to the Select Committee. I only wish that these points should be very carefully considered and, if necessary, the evidence of the landlords be taken and all care taken to protect the rights of both the landlord and the tenant. If there are really difficulties in the way of a tenant being allowed to settle peaceably on the land which he has occupied for a long time, they ought certainly to be removed when the Bill goes before the Select Committee."

* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"At this stage, I wish only to refer to two features in the Bill, and both these features have been referred to practically by all the speakers who have preceded me. The first point that I wish to refer to is the revision of rent. It has been said by the hon. the Mover and the Seconder that in the revision of rent, inasmuch as power is given to the landlord to enhance the rent, a similar power for reduction of rent should also be given to the tenant. It seems to me that the principle advocated by both these hon. Members is an equitable one, and the principle has been recognized in other statutes also. My Friend, Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti, referred to the agency for the reduction or enhancement of rent. If I understood him correctly he stated that either the Corporation or the Standing Committee might be entrusted with this duty and responsibility. It seems to me that the best agency for considering the reduction of rent is also the agency for considering the enhancement of rent. If the court has been considered the proper agency for enhancement of rent, the court, I submit, is also the proper agency for reduction of rent. It is only a mutuality of rights and it seems to me that nothing can be said against this.

"The other point that I wish to refer to at this stage of the question relates to improvements. My hon. Friend the Law Member did not refer to this aspect of the question at all, but my Friend Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti has in a measure objected to extending the Bill with reference to improvements. As it is, the Bill recognizes only the value of certain improvements. It seems to me that all improvements should be recognized as such. With reference to that, there is no difficulty whatever. The hon. the Mover of the Bill has brought in a definition of the word 'Improvement.'

[24th August 1925]

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Mr. President, Sir, the arguments advanced are not convincing. They are not sustainable. In the first place, Sir, to say that the rate-payers are not required to vote every year is not correct. Casual vacancies arise and the rate-payers may be required to elect their representatives for the particular ward. Besides, this principle is generally accepted. It is only those that have paid their dues that are entitled to vote in the elections. Otherwise even those who have not paid their dues will be entitled to record their votes. Moreover, the acceptance of this principle will have an educative value. The very fact that the electoral rolls are being revised annually will make the people think about their franchise. Under these circumstances, I cannot allow the amendment proposed in the Bill. I object to the Bill being referred to the Select Committee.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Sir, I am quite surprised at the attitude taken up by the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government. The position taken up in the Bill is this. If a man is assessed for certain taxes and it so happens that he has not paid the taxes, he should not, in addition to the liability to pay his taxes which can be enforced by the party concerned going to the law courts, be disenfranchised. That is the real question and I hope my hon. Friend will view it in that light. I am not pleading for any special concession for anybody—either this party or any other parties. Here is a liability and you can always enforce the liability by going to a court. But why do you in addition disenfranchise the man by excluding him from the electoral roll? You do not find a condition of that kind in the Legislative Council rules.”

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ May I just interrupt for a minute? There is no question of disenfranchisement. It is only those who have paid the taxes that are enfranchised. Others are not. When they are not enfranchised, the question of disenfranchisement does not arise.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ My hon. Friend is logically correct. But a person who has been assessed to a certain amount is entitled to be included in the electoral roll for the Legislative Council whether he has paid all the taxes or not, simply because there are other ways by which the Government can recover the dues. I do not think that this additional penalty, viz., depriving him of his vote and thus bringing down his political status also, must be added to it. As I said before, it is not a party question. What already exists in the rules and regulations relating to the Legislative Council elections is sought to be extended to the local boards and the municipalities.”

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ Sir, I am somewhat surprised that the hon. Minister has taken the view which he has taken this morning over this question. The working of this Act in the mufassal has caused a good deal of hardship. I can quote a number of cases where a man who has been assessed for Rs. 400 and Rs. 500 is not included in the list simply because he has not paid one or two taxes of such small sums as 4 annas or 8 annas as animal tax or vehicle tax. Though he has paid all the other taxes, his name is not included simply because he has not paid 4 annas or 8 annas, a small tax. In some municipalities people take advantage of this and they are unscrupulous

[18th August 1925]

A.—(a) & (b) Land assigned to ex-service men is liable to resumption by Government in case of alienation by way of sale, gift, mortgage or lease in perpetuity within ten years from the date of the grant. Similarly, lands assigned to depressed classes are subject to resumption if alienated at any time in the manner above described except to other members of the same class. A lease other than a perpetual lease is a method of enjoyment which is not forbidden by the terms of the grant.

Assignment of lands to an Adi-Dravida in Gudiyattam taluk

* 19 Q.—MR. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue and the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that an Adi-Dravida of Ambur, Vedamakkam, applied to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupattur, and the Collector of North Arcot for the assignment by darkhast of lands, survey Nos. 342 and 343 in the village of Balur, Gudiyattam taluk, on 5th February 1923 and several times afterwards;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam taluk declined to assign the said lands to the petitioner in question;

(c) whether it is a fact that a rich caste man, one Kannayya Nayudu, is now permitted to cultivate the lands mentioned above and that they will be soon assigned to him; and

(d) if the Government have no information with reference to clauses (a), (b) and (c), whether they will be pleased to call for the information?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government do not know whether or no the facts are as alleged in the question.

(d) As the darkhast rules provide for an appeal and also in certain circumstances for revision, the Government do not propose to intervene at this stage.

MR. R. VEERIAN:—“With reference to answer to (a), (b) and (c), may I know if there is any difficulty in calling for the information? If so, what are the difficulties?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“The only difficulty is that this matter is subject to an appeal in the ordinary course. In the existing state of affairs the Government do not wish to interfere.”

MR. R. VEERIAN:—“I have not heard a word of the reply, Sir.”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“The reason, Sir, is given in clause (d) of the answer.”

Alleged auctioning of lands reserved for depressed classes.

* 20 Q.—MR. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is the practice to exhibit a copy of the list containing darkhast lands available for assignment to the depressed classes in all the village chavadis and in taluk offices;

(b) why lands intended for assignment to the depressed classes are generally being auctioned; and

(c) whether the Government are aware of such instances?

[Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [24th August 1925]

them. How are you going to remedy them? Not by saying that all those who are liable to be assessed should be put on the electoral rolls as being eligible for exercising their franchise, because it leads to another evil which you did not at all contemplate. We can very easily meet this difficulty. You and I have got the same object. We want to see that these electoral rolls must show the name of everybody who has got a right to exercise his franchise and none else. Therefore let us think of a method by which this work can be done without complaint. I give an easy solution which I think would meet the difficulty that I have pointed out—I am not putting this as the solution of a party of this House—and that is, instead of leaving the preparation of the electoral rolls in the hands of the municipal councils a certain member or a set of persons should be asked to undertake the preparation of these electoral rolls. I mean to say that its preparation should be left in the hands of those who cannot by any possibility manipulate these electoral rolls to suit their own purpose.”

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—“ This amendment does not affect the position taken up by the hon. Member.”

* Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ It does, in this way. We shall see what is the basis for this Bill and what is the justification under which Mr. Pantulu Ayyar brings forward this amendment. He wants an agency to avoid all the evils which I have been trying to explain to the House. He knows there are persons who have been excluded from the list for no fault of theirs. In order to avoid this evil, Mr. Pantulu Ayyar says that all persons who are liable for payment of taxes should be entered in the electoral list. I know of a case where the previous electoral roll contained 4,000 persons, while the revised roll showed only 1,500, the remaining 2,500 persons belonging to a certain party. Legally speaking, the authorities under the existing law have a perfect right to do what they can. I therefore venture to think that it would be better to have an extra municipal authority to prepare these electoral rolls, to scrutinize them, to hear objections, and to allow names to be included afterwards, if necessary. That suggestion might be taken up by the Government and incorporated in the amending Bill which has been put forward.”

* Mr. V. PANTULU AYYAR :—“ I never imputed any motives to anybody in presenting this Bill. What I wanted to safeguard against was that if people by an accident or neglect of the municipal authorities failed to pay on the 31st March, or even if they did pay a day after, or a fraction of the amount was not paid, their names should not be left out of the electoral roll. Of course, it cannot be proved by any Government records that after five years' working of this Act the collection of taxes has been facilitated by making payment qualification as a condition precedent for getting qualified as a voter. In a recent petition addressed by the people of Tiruvadi, they state that out of 10,000 people, there are 2,000 persons who are qualified to vote and out of these only some 300 were included in the list. The object of the Bill is to prevent chances for corrupt practices in election to municipalities and other local bodies and also to afford a clear opportunity to people to get their civic consciousness developed as far as practicable under this Act. Such complaints are numerous in many local bodies and more specially so in municipalities.”

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920, AND 603
THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920, OF MR. V. PANTULU AYYAR

24th August 1925]

The motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows :—

Ayes

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Mr. B. Obalesappa. | 16. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 2. „ C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 17. Mr. G. Rameswara Rao. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 18. Sriman Sasibhushan Rath Mahasayo. |
| 4. „ T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 19. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 5. Mr. K. Uppi Sahib. | 20. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 6. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| 7. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 22. „ Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 8. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 23. „ Ghouse Mian Sahib. |
| 9. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. | 24. „ B. P. Sessa Reddi. |
| 10. Mr. A. Chidambara Nadar. | 25. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 11. „ C. Gopala Menon. | 26. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. |
| 12. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 27. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 13. „ C. Maruthavanam Pillai. | 28. „ V. C. Vellingiri Gounder. |
| 14. „ Moosa Sait. | 29. „ B. Venkataratnam. |
| 15. „ V. Pantulu Ayyar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 24. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu. |
| 2. „ Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks. | 25. „ V. Madhava Raja. |
| 3. „ Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 26. „ T. Mallesappa. |
| 4. „ Mr. T. E. Moir. | 27. „ P. N. Marthandam Pillai. |
| 5. „ Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivaganesan Pillai. | 28. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayana Nambudiri. |
| 6. „ Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. | 29. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 7. „ the Raja of Panagal. | 30. „ K. Raghuchandra Ballal. |
| 8. Mr. G. T. Boag. | 31. „ G. Premayya. |
| 9. „ G. T. H. Bracken. | 32. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 10. „ Abdulla Ghatala Sahib. | 33. Honorary Lieutenant Madurai. |
| 11. „ S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | 34. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 12. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 35. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 13. Sir K. Venkatarajayya. | 36. Rao Bahadur P. Raman. |
| 14. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 37. Mr. P. Sagaram. |
| 15. „ M. C. Raju. | 38. „ R. Srinivasan. |
| 16. Mr. P. K. S. A. Arumuga Nadar. | 39. „ M. Ratnaswami. |
| 17. „ A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 40. „ K. Sarabha Reddi. |
| 18. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 41. Rao Sahib P. V. S. Sundaramurti. |
| 19. Mr. N. Devendrudu. | 42. Mr. R. Veerian. |
| 20. Rao Bahadur Cruz Fernandez. | 42. Diwan Bahadur W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 21. Rao Sahib P. V. Gopalan. | 44. Mr. K. Venkatachala Patayachi. |
| 22. Zamindar of Kollikote. | 45. „ Moidu Sahib. |
| 23. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Nayudu. | 46. „ Abdul Wahab Sahib. |

29 voted *for* the motion and 46 *against*.

The motion was lost.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“ May I take it that the third reading of this Bill will be taken up at the next sitting ? ”

1-15 p.m. The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—“ I cannot say anything now. I will give my considered opinion later on. The hon. the Law Member will explain the situation.” (Laughte).

* The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“ Mr. Deputy President, Sir, I was not here when the ruling was given from the chair, but I take it there was a misapprehension as to what had actually transpired and what the vote of the Council was. I take it that it is open to the hon. the

604 A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920, AND
THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920, OF MR. V. PANTULU AYYAR

[Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [24th August 1925]

President or Deputy President, occupying the chair, if there was a general misapprehension as to a particular event occurring, to say so and to go back to the stage prior to the occurrence of that event. But now, I am afraid the position has been complicated by the vote that has been taken and, if I may respectfully urge, Sir, I suggest that the matter may be considered and your ruling may be given to-morrow or the day after."

* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—"There was a misapprehension, and I wanted to go back, but the opposition with one united voice have stuck to the technical error. So, I thought we had better pass on and bring it to this deadlock." (Laughter.)

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. Deputy President, may I, on a point of order, explain . . ." (Cries of 'Order, order').

* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—"I shall give my considered opinion to-morrow, after consulting the hon. the Law Member. The subject need not be prolonged now."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Are we not entitled to be consulted, Sir?"

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"Obey the chair."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I have obeyed."

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, OF MR.
G. RAMESWARA RAO.

At this stage Sriman Sasibhushan Rath Mahasayo, one of the panel of chairmen, took the chair.

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920. My amendment is, in the main, as follows:

'At the end of the proviso to section 54 add the words "or a village karnam".'

"The section as it stands runs thus:

'No person shall be qualified for election as a member of a taluk or union board unless the name of such person appears on the electoral roll of the taluk or union board concerned.
(2) No salaried officer of Government shall be qualified for election as member of a local board: provided that this prohibition shall not apply to the village headman.'

"The object of my amending Bill is to put the village headman and the karnam on the same uniform basis. In fact, I tried to put a question on this point and obtain an answer from the Government as to why this distinction was made. It is question No. 721 put at the meeting held on 13th October 1924. The question was whether any difference existed as regards . . ."

Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo (from the Chair):—"Order, order. The hon. Member will note that, under Standing Order 37, he need not make any explanatory statement now. If his motion is objected to, he may make such a statement."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"Sir, there is no objection on the part of the Government for leave being granted."

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted to introduce the Bill.